

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| 10/830,044 04/23/2004 | | Yasuhiro Ogata | Q80791 | 8714 | | |
| 23373 | 7590 09/26/2006 | EXAMINER | | | | |
| SUGHRUE MION, PLLC | | | SHEWAREGED, BETELHEM | | | |
| SUITE 800 | YLVANIA AVENUE, N.V | <i>N</i> . | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| WASHINGTO | ON, DC 20037 | 1774 | | | | |
| · | | | DATE MAILED: 00/26/2006 | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | • | | |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| Advisory Action | 10/830,044 OGATA ET AL. | | |
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Betelhem Shewareged | 1774 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>21 August 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR | ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods: | wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in one one with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply more | idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | rce, which FR 41.31; or (3) |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing dat | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 | (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | • | |
| have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | shortened statutory period for reply originar than three months after the mailing da | inally set in the final Offic | ce action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed | ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below.) | onsideration and/or search (see NO | , will <u>not</u> be entered be TE below); | ecause |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or | | ducing or simplifying | the issues for |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finally rej | ected claims. | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)) | • | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co | mpliant Amendment (| (PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s |): | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). | illowable if submitted in a separate, | timely filed amendme | ent canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | ☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will by will by will by will be will b | ll be entered and an e | explanation of |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6 and 8-22</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | Abeles and the transfer | - 41 - 5 A - 1 - 111 | |
| 3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar | ut before or on the date of filing a No nd sufficient reasons why the affidav | otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> rit or other evidence is | t be entered necessary and |

| 8. 🗀 | The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered |
|------|---|
| | because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and |
| | was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). |

- 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

- 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
- 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

| ^ | _ | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|----|----|---|--|--|
| ٠. | | 0 | н. | nr | • | | |
| J. | | | u | | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument is based on that neither Majumdar or Ohbayashi teaches or suggests the use of polyvinyl alcohol as a binder in the colorant receiving layer, as recited in the presently amended Claim 1; however, this argument is not persuasive because the claim does not recite polyvinyl alcohol as a binder in the colorant receiving layer. In addition, Applicant has provided a declaration to show that the ink-jet recording sheets of the Examples of the present invention, in which a water-swellable synthetic mica is used, showed much better curling resistance than the ink-jet recording sheet of Comparative Example 3, in which the smectite is used; however, the declaration is not acceptable because there are more that 1 different conditions between Example 1 and Comparative Example 3. The different conditions are: A: mica is used in Example 1, and Smectite is used in Comparative Example 3; B: the amount of mica is 40 parts in Example 1, and the amount of Smectite is 100 parts in Comparative Example 3; C: PVA (Gosefinemer Z-100) is used in Example 1, and PVA (PVA-117) is used in Comparative Example 3; and D: the amount of PVA is 100 parts in Example 1, and the amount of PVA is 100 parts in Example 3. It is not clear if condition A, B, C or D caused the differences in the final property.

BETELHEM SHEWAREGET PRIMARY EXAMINER